

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/721,081	11/26/2003	Sadao Kadokura	032120	7841
38834 75	90 03/21/2006		EXAMINER	
	N, HATTORI, DANIE	MCDONALD, RODNEY GLENN		
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW SUITE 700		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTON, DC 20036			1753	

DATE MAILED: 03/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Commons	10/721,081	KADOKURA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Rodney G. McDonald	1753			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address			
• •	V 10 OFT TO EVOIDE A MONTH	(C) OD THIDTY (20) DAYS			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D.  Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period to Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 D	ecember 2005				
	s action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa		osecution as to the merits is			
closed in accordance with the practice under E	•				
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are pending in the application					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	rom concideration.				
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.				
Application Papers	·				
·· _	-				
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc		Evaminer			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119/a	)-(d) or (f).			
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	, priority and c. c. c. c. g. 1 (c.	, (2) 6. (.).			
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received.				
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior					
application from the International Bureau	u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	∍d.			
Attachment(s)					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary				
2)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P	ate Patent Application (PTO-152)			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:				

Art Unit: 1753

### **DETAILED ACTION**

## **Double Patenting**

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-12 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-25 of U.S. Patent No. 6,881,311 in view of Kadokura et al. (U.S. Pat. 4,784,739) and Madocks (US PG Pub 2004/0149574).

Claims 1-25 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,881,311 teach the claimed except for the auxiliary electrode which absorbs electrons.

Kadokura et al. '739 teach providing an anode electrode 130 in the shape of a ring arranged around the front of the reflecting electrode 110. According to this arrangement of the anode electrode 130, the amount of capturing of electrons during

Art Unit: 1753

the sputtering can be easily controlled. (Column 7 lines 52-64) Kadokura et al. '739 teach locating the anode electrode in the plasma confinement space near the center line. (Column 7 lines 52-64) Kadokura et al. '739 teach depositing on an organic substrate. (Column 16 lines 57-58)

The motivation for utilizing an anode electrode in a facing target sputtering device is that it allows for capturing electrons. (Column 7 lines 52-64)

Madocks teach an anode with a U-shape. (See Fig. 1) The anode must inherently attach to a member of the apparatus and in Kadokura '564 this would have to be the closure plate. (See Kadokura '564 discussed above)

The motivation for utilizing a U-shape electrode and attaching the electrode to the closure pipe is that it allows for trapping the electron hall current. (See Abstract)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made to have modified U.S. Pat. No. 6,881,311 by providing an auxiliary electrode to absorb electrons as taught by Kadokura et al. and Madocks because it allows for capturing electrons.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed December 29, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections have been overcome by Applicant's declaration which establishes invention of the subject matter of the rejected claims prior to the effective date of Kadokura (2003-155564).

Application/Control Number: 10/721,081

Art Unit: 1753

The remaining issue is the obviousness type double patenting rejection.

Applicant has argued that Kadokura et al. '739 fails to show placing an anode in the plasma confinement space for capturing electrons and fails to show the use of two anodes. The Examiner argues that Kadokura et al. '739 does teach an anode 130 that can be placed in the plasma space for capturing electrons. Kadokura et al. '739 specifically teach that the location of the anode 130 can be adjusted to control the amount of capturing of electrons. (Kadokura et al. '739) Thus suggesting locating the anode in the plasma space. Furthermore, Kadokura et al. '739 teach an anode electrode 110 which could constitute a frame of the apparatus. Specifically anode 110 is an anode because it can be positively charged. (Kadokura et al. '739 Column 8 lines 29-35) The obviousness type double patenting rejection will be maintained.

#### Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rodney G. McDonald whose telephone number is 571-272-1340. The examiner can normally be reached on M- Th with Every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam X. Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-1342. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Rodney G. McDonald Primary Examiner Art Unit 1753

RM March 14, 2006